



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/573,656	11/20/2006	Tomoyuki Shinoda	0599-0214PUS1	5671

2292 7590 12/02/2010
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

PATEL, RONAK C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1788

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

12/02/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Attachment to Advisory Action

1. Applicants' amendment filed 10/22/10 has been fully considered but the amendment has not been entered given that the amendment raises new issues that would require further consideration and/or search.

Specifically, claim 12 has been amended to recite that the adhesive composition comprises "thermoplastic resin selected from a group consisting of polyimide, polyetherimide, polyamide, polyamideimide, polyethersulfone, and polyetherether ketone", claims 14 and 15 have each been amended to recite a prepreg base material "in which a reinforcing fiber base material is impregnated with a matrix resin", and claim 15 has been amended to recite that the adhesive resin film comprises "thermoplastic resin". The amendments to claims 12 and 14-15 narrow the scope of each of the claims and set forth limitations not previously presented or considered by the examiner. Such amendments, therefore, raise new issues that would require further consideration and search.

Further, the amendment has not been entered given that the amendment raises new issues that would require further consideration under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Specifically, claim 12 recites improper Markush language. In line 3 of the claim, it is advised that "a group" is changed to "the group".

It is noted that *if* the amendment were entered, the amendment would overcome the 35 USC 112, first and second paragraph rejections of record.

/Callie E. Shosho/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1787